ROUGH: return notes to Anne Hanson after typing

M 2142

Thursday June 22, 1972

Barn

Group II

MR. NYLAND: So we can try it without light for a little while, eh? Will we end up in darkness? As long as the rainy season lasts, you know, it is better to meet here; I'm sorry, but too much rain on the roof upstairs, you wouldn't be able to hear.

What will I say? I don't want to be a kind of a truant office, but we talk many times about a level, a level of behavior at the Barn and whenever I feel that something is still wrong or that you should think about that (?) you might have forgotten or that you don't know in ignorance, I have to say it. I want to remind you that lunches here at the Barn are only for those people who belong to Work and preferably even those who are busy in their activities. So it's only to give an opportunity for such people to come here and have a chance to talk if they want to about different affairs that may be of concern to them - partly activity maybe and partly realization of themselves. So that no visitors are allowed. And particularly not, like happened this week, long-haired ones. As you know, I definitely object to it. It was wrong even to invite him. Try to keep this in mind.

Also the question of cups. They gradually disappear. It's not possible

that you, uh, by mistake put it in your pocket, is it? But you see, they're not broken, otherwise we would know. And with the Pottery preparing for Bennington and so forth, it's rather difficult for them to make them, so today you had to use paper cups. It is not right. When we have a Pottery as activity of course, in time they can supply whatever we need, but may I remind you of that. It is a form of carelessness, I think. Sometimes question of tools and the usage of tools gradually disappearing in your own tool box by mistake - also that is not right. You have to lean over backwards, really, that you look and see yourself as a person who is in charge of something that is not even your own, and for that you should have even more responsibility. After all it is a question of trying to grow up, in an understanding of oneself first, and gradually hoping to change that into a different kind of a person who is beginning to be conscious or at least sees the light of consciousness. And of course together with that, conscience.

What is conscience and what is consciousness? What is it in ordinary life? You remember Gurdjieff's fable about the wolf and the sheep, to keep both intact and not to let them fight and eat each other up. You remember how necessary it is that someone is in--in charge of that. We are trying to build up certain things within oneself and for short, we call it 'inner life' because we have really no other name for it. And the assumption is that there is a little bit of inner life that can be awakened or can be encouraged to want to grow up or grow out. But you see the same question arises when one says, there is a little 'I' already, only it's covered.

We talk about Work simply because the little 'I' is not usable, which is the same as saying that it doesn't exist for practical purposes. And practical purposes means that it is being used in order to obtain practical data by means of practice. Now it is quibbling without--with a few words if you say something is already in existence. You see that is the assumption of Christianity a great deal: that there is already a Soul and that that Soul is set free when one dies.

And because of that, that people who die on this Earth will go to heaven, that their Soul will go to heaven.

I don't think we agree entirely with that when you follow Gurdjieff. A soul is something that has to be Worked for. Whatever there is, (as?) potential, has to be made real. The actualize--actualization of potentiality is very much something that exists 'as if' and has to become actually existing. Now it comes to the same thing if I say, I wish to create an 'I', because it isn't there; - as saying, I wish this what is within me and is asleep to wake up. For practical purposes the result is that something starts to exist then which functions differently from my ordinary state of unconsciousness. It's very much the same as if I assume that something unconscious exists and that perhaps, I call it sometimes subconscious, when it is a little bit further away even from my ordinary unconscious state - then that subconsciousness should be brought to the foreground and become conscious. For practical purposes it is of no use to me when it is covered up by all kind of layers which I have to take away. And if it is a question of Work, it can be Work on oneself in order to eliminate the different layers which are now covering up that what is more important or even holier than I am. Or that I say, I want to create something which does not exist now but then, if it could exist, could function in a certain way, and it takes also Work to create it and to build it up. So don't let's have any, I say, quibbling of words about that. For practical purposes, 'I' is non-existent. If I am an agnostic, I don't acknowledge the existence of God. And if I want to become religious, then I start to assume that there is a God in whom I can have belief. It's the same thing. I don't wish to deny that 'I' could exist in a totality of the universe and representing to some extent something that exists in heaven, but it is not a part of me until it actually starts to associate, as it were, with me. And then it will have a meaning.

I think this question of 'I' not existing and having to be created is very fundamental. And there should not be any objection of saying that it is 'I'

because that's the terminology we use. We could say - a little bit of consciousness - if you like. You could say even - a little section of my brain that starts to function in a different manner - but what is the objection of calling it 'I'? After all it is an 'I' as a capital 'I' and the aim is that this 'I' ultimately should represent the totality of me when this what is me has grown up and is full-grown. And by that we mean that the three bodies actually could exist together and ~~independently of each other~~ be united if necessary for a definite purpose or could function independently of each other and at the same time recognizing the existence of each other. So that then the three could function in harmony.

I think the question that comes up several times about Work and beginners of making attempts to the best of their ability and having heard enough about Work and for a little while it remains theoretical knowledge which is given to them to be digested, then when they start to digest it in the best way they can, of course they will start to use a terminology that is familiar to them. And even if they say, it is for me as if there was a little 'I' watching me - it's very much the same as saying - when you were a little child that there were angels which were watching over you. Then the answer is not to deny what attempt has been made. When a person brings that up that he was trying to watch, or that something was trying to watch him, the answer is - Yes, you're absolutely right. That is how we begin with Work. We don't know in the beginning what is further needed. But an observation process starts with an observation and we define it afterwards, that it is an observation of a certain kind, in which the observee has to have a definite quality and should not be interfered with by that what is observed, by that what is the objective of the observation.

But you cannot discourage people when they start to try to Work and do their best, and then unfortunately use a word which with your advanced knowledge you ofcourse will say - It is not the same as awareness. And even if you say 'alert' or 'being alive' or 'watching' with it is terminology of an unconscious world which (?)

we are familiar, and with which a person who starts to Work is of course familiar. He doesn't know as yet the distinction between that so-called 'alertness' and 'awareness' until it is explained.

So when that question came up last Monday and there was a long rigamarole of an answer, it was really much too bad. It should not have been answered that way at all. The person who asked - I do not know who it was and it doesn't matter - should be encouraged to say - yes, we try to watch. But now you must not forget how to watch, because something else has to be involved in that watching process because watching means I have an interest. But now this interest has to become objective. And then you could explain what is meant by that so-called objective observation by the introduction of the word, impartiality, which of course is not understood at all in the beginning. Also when you use the word "Identification," you don't make a distinction enough what you mean by one word and another. The result comes to the same. But identification with an object is (a) part of yourself goes out to the object and becomes identified with that. Impartiality is that 'I' as an observer am entirely oblivious, almost, to the existence of that what is, so that nothing of me goes out, but the result for me is an impartial objective state.

You're not quite clear in the usage of such words when they are used by someone else and you must then straighten them out. You must constantly be alert to what someone else is saying and why they are saying it, and not expecting them to use terminology of an objective kind a la Gurdjieff. You cannot expect it.

A few days ago I got a tape from one of the places where they are trying to make a little group, and they were listening to one of the meeting tapes from here. And it was then asked of the different members of that little group to give their impressions after they had heard it. And it was most interesting to hear what they--those people who never heard a tape before but who were to some extent familiar with Work. I do not know what was their particular background, mostly only reading or maybe someone else explaining to them or having read Ouspensky or maybe Nicoll or whoever it is I do not know - but then the reaction

towards what they heard. And there was one who said, It was really the first time that I hear Work described in a certain way when I thought that I knew about Work and this is entirely different. And it made me think. Are we talking really objective sense? Do we every once in a while question our own statements? Do we understand the words we use and why we use them? And do we compare them with that what we have read in ALL AND EVERYTHING, or that what is definitely said by Gurdjieff and also in a few places by Ouspensky, and without any question by Orage? And are we at the present time in our meetings adhering sufficiently exactly to that what is required in order to become logically convinced of the value of this kind of reasoning? And it is important that you question yourself every once in a while that whatever you say has already gone through the mill of your experience, so that then that what you wish to say has become a real part, and you communicate that what is a gift in explaining, as if that gift comes from you as part of you, and you share it. But it is not done by the denial of an attempt (that) was very definitely made in perfectly good faith as it were. And you have to set them on the right road by just telling them - when you watch, when something is watching, that watching has to be a very special process. It has to include this impartiality which we talk about, which really means that that what is being watched or seen, or to which you are alert, or which shows aliveness, or which in our terminology we say is being observed, is created because this 'I' is aware of the existence of that object which happens to be me, my personality in a certain form of behavior. And the acceptance of that behavior for whatever it happens to be. That's the only time you can use the word 'being', because the existence of that what is the personality as it is, but you cannot use 'being' in place of 'I'.

'I' is a very strange kind of a concept in the beginning. Of course it is tinted a little bit intellectually, or a mental description is given by indicating that there has to be an observation process, and we are familiar with the recording in such a process of observation or even of being in the process of watching some-

thing, that that what is the object of being watched or observed, the image of that is recorded in your mind. That is the only thing that can be called a little intellectual. But it is not very much. Because you talk about things you see and you simply say a of course, it goes through my eyes and it forms an image on the retina and it is transferred to my brain in some way or other, and then I see it and my brain recognizing that what I have seen before, and even then classifying it. Or if it is something entirely new it is like a new impression. And an observation process is exactly the same thing.

But you see we link up this so-called mental activity with a tremendous wish. And because of that there is already a relationship between a function of my mind, or a part of my mind functioning in a very special way, with that what is another part of me as a personality, wishing for something so that then ~~(that)~~ observation process can give me information. Because I'm after knowledge, and I wish it really intensely because I know that with my ordinary unconscious mind functioning, I cannot really rely on the knowledge I have obtained so far.

That is what has to be explained: that when you say, I watch myself, you have a process with which you are familiar. Because we do that many times - that you have seen yourself behave, or that someone else tells you that you have done this and that, and you recollect it. Or when you describe a scene in which you have taken a part, of course it was the result of having watched a variety of different influences or factors or different personages or whatever may have been there under your watchful eye. But when it is 'I', it is not a being in our sense of the word. The only thing that 'I' observes is the fact of being of my physical body existing. 'I' is not the same as the being of a person when we write it with a capital 'B'. We know that in unconscious description, there are levels of being of different persons at certain heights, or levels, or levels of interest. And of course they are, so they belong to the realm of being. But we don't distinguish very much about the level of beings in an unconscious state. We even say it is a human being. Logically it means it exists.

But when it is used in connection with Work, "Being" does not take the place of 'I'. 'I' is an instigating force. 'I' is the instrument (which ~~that~~) starts certain things going. 'I' is useful to obtain data about myself which have to be truthful. And only when there are enough truthful data or facts about myself in existence which gradually have become part of me, then this change that takes place in a person, and changing over from a personality to an individuality, changes the level of being of such a man. And then when it is, you might say, above the particular line separating unconscious from consciousness, it acquires a capital 'B'. So it is instigated by 'I'. But 'I' creates the condition of myself growing under the influence of 'I' and then acquiring gradually a being of a different kind of character which we call a quality character, having consciousness and conscience and having a will. And that really a Being with a most big capital 'B' is only reached when the totality of the growth has been accomplished and that the three full-grown bodies are in existence. That is really a Being.

The function of 'I' in all these processes of growth is constantly to instigate activity. To make activity possible. Not only to make it reasonable in existence, but to indicate gradually what is there and becoming familiar with it. So that when this 'I' when more and more full-grown - because you might say of its own practice in the presence of ~~myself~~ 'one' acquiring knowledge of me, and in that process growing up to become the guide for me - this process of 'I' being full-grown, and then you might say coming down to participate in the (my) realm of where I live in my unconsciousness, all of that will have the result of the creation of a being which will be my self but then in a conscious and conscientious state.

I said a little while ago it is of course necessary to mention 'I'. What else will you use? Objective faculty? You can only use it when you want to explain it. 'I' has a meaning, because ultimately it will explain the totality of oneself as a real 'I' and not the 'I' which one uses every once in a while and which are many facets of a particular personality. No questions about false 'I's and all the rest. That doesn't matter very much. Each I, when I say I do this and I do that, and I think and I feel - all of that, it's always me, and it's not a question if

I'm so forgetful that the little 'I's so-called don't know each other. They know each other well enough. They're different facets, different outlooks sometimes, different windows through which I happen to look to the outside world. But you must remember that 'I' as a word has a very definite meaning. And it should occur in any explanation of any question. And it should be definitely indicated what is meant. Even if you use the word "Objective faculty," you should say, that means there is something that has a quality which is different from any mental function that we are acquainted with. That there is definitely this 'I' wanting to exist because, you might say, it has been commanded.

What is the result of a real wish for the creation of an 'I'? I put myself in a state of wanting to be influenced by something of a higher nature. I want God, if that is an aim, to come to me, or I beg Him to send His Messenger from Above to me, personally, and then that becomes for me, personally, my 'I'. Because I wish to grow up. That is, Me as personality is incomplete.

So for that reason you must continue to use it, and use it as something that exists when it is created within you, not outside. Don't use the terminology 'as if' too soon for newcomers. They don't think about it at all. They don't even think about how to create 'I'. They start to understand that something of a different nature should be present to oneself and they really do not know how to make it. And they can't imagine it for quite some time, that it exists or not exists. But the point is always, when there is that which they believe exists, they furnish the information for this 'I' to grow up further on its own in a conscious state and existence. Later you can tell that that 'I' is really filled with information, aliveness coming from the totality of all life, and not from oneself. Because we, when we live in unsonsciousness, have no possibility of giving life to that what is objective. We can give life when we create something of this ordinary world in a form which belongs to the Earth. And then we can say that a part of my life is poured into it because I would like to make that what I create, alive. Almost, I would say, as if when I draw a picture that it could walk

away. Or when I have a painting of flowers that I almost can smell the fragrance. Or when there is something like nature that I try to depict and there are hills and mountains and a river and valleys, it is as if that what is alive is behind the mountain.

Many times that kind of form of aliveness that is created by a man when he is unconscious, gets mixed up with the quality of the aliveness of 'I'. And you must be very careful that you don't mix it.

'I', when it functions, is not at all alive in the sense that we know life. In the first place it's completely unbound. It is not bounded by any form. In the second place, as in nature, it is omnipresent. It is not full-grown, but the quality of principle is there. It is omniscient, and it is omnipotent. Those are three qualities of 'I' when God deigns (~~deems?~~) it necessary, is kind enough you might say, to fill it. With that as a messenger from above coming to tell me - it is my 'I' - tell me what to do. This is one of the reasons why, when one wishes to create 'I' and you want to use it, you're under an obligation. You cannot evoke something to come down from heaven and not cherish it. You are bound by that force that you have asked. You asked for that as a miracle. When a miracle happens, you're up against it because you've got to use it. Otherwise you're not entitled to ask for the second time.

So there is no use playing with these words. They have to have an exact meaning for one and it should be very clear of what is meant. At the same time you should remain very simple in an answer. You should not introduce all kind of things that you happen to perhaps know about, or let's assume even, to be on the right side, that you have experienced. Knowledge of that kind is not to be dispensed just to everybody. That is the wisdom of objectivity that belongs to the responsibility of esoteric knowledge. You have no right to talk in the language of our last meetings of this last year, let's say, towards people who just ~~being~~ begin in their Working efforts. You're quite wrong to think that they could understand it and you're more wrong that you think you have a right to

tell them. You have to choose your words very carefully. And that's why I say so many times you have to be down to the Earth where such a person lives and from there you start to build up to the extent that the other person can follow you. And then as a good measure, to let it run over, as it were, you can give a little perspective of what the aim might be, and indicate it in very vague words, and not start describing what may be ten thousand years away from them in their experience. I say I would give you the benefit of the doubt, that you have actually experienced everything you're talking about. But I do question it once in a while, because we are big imitators and we do know certain language that we have heard and we can repeat it. We are very much, sometimes, parrot-like, and unless it is convincingly expressed, unless it is felt that it is based on experience, it will do more harm than good. Be much shorter in answering - I'm talking now in a very general way, but I have in mind the Monday evening of course. I would like you to just be exact and make statements and tell them - do this and do that , and come back next week. And no further rigamarole and embroidery. That you can wait with. You can do that in your own little group. You can do that when you talk to yourself. You can do that when you write to your father and mother about something that concerns you if you want to indicate that it really touches your heart. But in a meeting it is not necessary when you have new people who want to Work.

Now it's different when one wants to talk, as it were, to an audience. Because with an audience you don't have that kind of a contact of a question, and therefore it can be very general. And when you talk to a larger group, you can go into certain detail in order to create perspectives. Because perspectives must be given to those people who do not know very much about Work, and for whom the name Gurdjieff is almost anathema. At least they don't know very much about him, and perhaps if they do, it's a little prejudicial. Then, you might say it is allowed. But that is the only time.

Of course there is another time. But that belongs to one's inner life. It belongs to an exchange between people of the same caliber. That belongs to discussions of private life. That belongs to group memebrs when they really want to get down to the depth of an understanding of concepts. I want to compare experiences. But you see, I'm not talking about that. It is necessary to have such exchanges. But it is not in a group like on Monday.

Try to shorten your answers. They're much too long. Because you keep on repeating and adding to certain things which don't belong in the least. And it, all it does is creating confusion. If you can stick to just a few things and tell them - try if you can when you walk, to see yourself. Use those words,'to see yourself '. But seeing yourself in a very special way. And then explain, you might call it, the neutrality of such seeing. Of that which has included impartiality. Do not dwell too much on simultaneity because it is not of any concept that a person can understand. Do not talk too much about infinity. Not that you did this past Monday, but I am reminded of it, that the word is used every once in a while. And really it doesn't make enough sense because you don't know.

Who knows about infinity? Who knows about space? We talk a little bit about dimensions and say three, and dimensions in time, we say , three and then what? Do you understand a solid? By Experience? Can you understand historical time? As experience? Do you know what is the opposite of finite forms as an infinity? Or totality? Or endlessness? We use them in phraseology addressing a higher deity. We want to indicate that there is something within one which is not satisfied and that it has to use a word which is not at all satisfactory to one's brain, but might belong to the possibility of an understanding of a higher level, hoping then that such a word opens the door to that understanding. I see many times heaven as being closed up. And when one prays and looks up, sometimes it is as if a little bit of a trap door is open. And every once in a while it is possible to hear a voice saying, "Yes I hear you". That is the understanding of a prayer. That is what one wishes when you want to communicate

with that what is higher. Even in the presence of 'I' when created, one kneels down. You see, this 'I' is of royal nature; It is kingly, It belongs to the higher aristocracy of the spheres of heaven. It has qualities, when it is created correctly, of an entirely different nature. When Gurdjieff uses the word 'Great Nature' he means the all-encompassing of everything existing of what we call from our standpoint, nature. But from the standpoint of the universe, is great in its own greatness like all greatness His Endlessness.

Why do I say these things? Because you must have much more awe in your voice. Much more recognition of that what you are talking about as if you, in front of it, are really in fear, trembling for fear. You don't use the words in the right way.

All right, Bill. (Turning of cassete).

Why should there really be that attitude in the creation of 'I', that one has in regard to that and in that kind of a relationship that you consider yourself so small? Because you have to get rid of your unconsciousness. Because you have to lose yourself. You have to become completely free as a form of life because when you die, your body will stop; and all the concepts will stop, including the time concept . And it is that kind of freedom that you are after when you wish to create something to set you free and that the truth then can be made known to you. That is why one becomes involved in these kind of questions, I say, in fear - Kierkegaard calls it, in Fear and Trembling, in the presence of something. Of course it is something created as a miracle. Magician. And I'm still a pupil - l'apprentice sorcier, you know. And it may overtake you. And it may even kill you. Don't play with trifles of esoteric knowledge. You must know once and for all that it is necessary to stand in awe for God before Him.

Try to remember that when you make statements of these kinds of esoteric knowledge given and explained or used in some way or other, you become responsible for that kind of knowledge given away through you because you become a channel

through which that can flow. And how can you prepare for that? I say that really when I wish to Work, I come to my real Self, not just to myself. I come to something that is deep, and I cannot go farther than I can go. But I wish to go far, deep as I can go, because I have to stand on something. And if I don't go deep enough, I keep on floating. That's why it's so difficult to continue with Work.

And at the same time one must realize this, and I'm only saying it for the sake of advice, of telling you of what might be in store when you wish to continue to find out what is God? And why man exists and what is the aim for his life? And what he should do. And how he should go about doing that. That is that he constantly has to be in the presence of something that then, being kind and benevolent enough, could be communicated to himself. And that as a result of wishing to Work on himself - that is this time the small self - he remembers himself as real Self. And in Working and in the accumulation of certain facts about himself as he is, it converts gradually into a knowledge of a different kind of the reality of one's life as it is and always will be. And for the reason that it is necessary to accumulate that, is to prepare oneself for the possibility of lonesomeness.

Try to see it in that way because it must come when you want to continue to Work on yourself. It is not easy to give yourself up into the hands of not knowing what. It is so difficult to lose yourself. And at the same time the requirement, the necessity of the creation of friction of that is necessary to understand this destroying process of the manifestations which are of the Moon and have no particular substance, only a little reflected light. Wishing then to reach the reality of light, and for the time being accepting an unconscious brain not giving you light at all, not sufficiently to light you on a path which leads away from the Earth, and only very very slowly the recognition of that what is a nature, you might say, the Great Nature of 'I' being as I say of royal blood, royal Hanbledzoin, creating for oneself then an atmosphere or a level

towards which one strives. That then in the presence of that, and gradually becoming influenced by it, by 'I', that then it behooves a person to lose himself because what is his value? His value the way he knows himself only relates to the Earth. And the Earth is a puny little bit of a kind of a something that exists in its very very small little bit of a solar system, or - our own solar system. And what is it in the length of time? Or timelessness, when length even has disappeared?

You might say these are big aims. But they are perspectives for sight. Because it will gradually learn how to see. It will learn to see through you. And it may use sometimes your ordinary eyes to be able to look within to find out what is there still that can be tested and can remain. And that what is not right should be thrown out, and destoryed in the outside fires. Sometimes we call that hell.

What will a man do when he wishes to continue to live and becomes more and more lonesome, that he is up against it because he is losing a little grip on his ordinary life and not enough is as yet substituted in order to get hold of? And he flounders - you remember, even Beelzebub had that experience - like a puppy in a well, not knowing up and down because of a mistake. You think Gornahoor Harharkh made a mistake about that? It is a description of an experience of purification. And a person comes to a certain point in which he knows it has to be done, that purification - he cannot withdraw. He hates it. He does not wish to continue. He is afraid. He wants to hold back, to hold on to that what he has. He is not willing as yet to part with it. We face that many times during a day. We don't call it that way - we call it simply Identification, Being familiar with the way one is living. Being at home. Sometimes it is sleeping deeply.

There is an awakening but before this awakening comes, there is a period of being all by oneself. I call it lonesome. When there is nothing in existence

then the word is lonely. Lonesome should not be--not become lonely. Lonesome is that one is alone, but in the presence of something else, and then the lonesomeness disappears. Lineliness belongs to unconscious states. Londsomeness is the opening of the gate to enter into consciousness.

You will face it some time. I hope you will. Because it means you are growing. It means you are willing. It means you are ready to sacrifice a great deal of yourself. You're willing to live in simplicity. You're willing to prepare sufficiently for meeting your God. When you die you will meet your God, you will not meet the highest of the highest. You're not ready. We're so low on this Earth.

You meet God really when you meet your own Magnetic Center because that has the quality of infinity. That is the reason it's covered up by finiteness. That is why it is difficult to reach it because there is a whole region of loneliness in which you must Work and no one will understand you. You must try to understand that in the right way. It is not that you cannot communicate with words. Of course you can - and you can sometimes define certain states in which you are. But they don't touch your emotional qualities as yet sufficiently. And in the private life in relation to that what is the holiest of holiest within yourself, when you enter, you enter all by yourself, not anyone, not ~~without~~ your father or mother, not even your wife or husband. Not, of course, your children either. You are on your own, truly on your own. It says so in the Bible also. You must remember that. Sometimes it's necessary to realize what is required for becoming conscious and conscientious. And it is not that kind of an easy task that one says, I wish and it is there. A long time there is between the wish and the will to be there.

Why does Gurdjieff make this barrier one of conscious labor and very definitely intentional suffering? Why don't I wish to talk about it? Because it cannot be understand of what is really involved in that kind of creation of such conditions. It's only when one is drowning that one knows one must

drown. Then it will be given to you to get hold of that what will rescue you. And then it is time enough to talk about conscious labor. I talk about it as an aim towards which one strives. It is the aim of the preparation of the first triangle of your Soul. And what will come later is of no particular concern because really conscious labor can only start when the physical body has already been given up. And one does not expect anything anymore. Neither from anyone else outside, nor from oneself. The freedom should be that you could keep that in mind as an aim, and that every once in a while when you remember what you have said or what your thoughts have been, and you consider it, you sit quietly and you let them again pass by in review, that you honestly then try to see yourself and that there is something in judgment of your behavior of the past. Because you see that is not Work. But it is preparation of an audience, expectancy - a wishing to see a performance of the real 'I' when it will come and announce from the stage that your day has ended and the night has come.

It is not necessary to talk about these things to newcomers. These are questions ~~the~~ that belong only to those who have already seen and tasted a little and who do know how difficult it is and who can be sincere in their attempts. And also again and again I say for that reason do not talk too big. I know that at the present time I talk it and I tell you about it. And there are many of you at the present time in this audience who cannot understand it. All you can understand if you are sensitive is what is wishing to be said by my voice. But that what are the words cannot have a meaning because you have not even the experience let alone nothing within you has been uncovered sufficiently that it is, as it were, raw. If it were, it could not be touched, and if it is touched, which can happen accidentally, you would cry out loud.

It happens once in a while, and in such a state you must not give up. Of course it's easy to say it. But you must continue to wish. You must be persistent. You must know that this road is a very long one. You must know that it is

necessary to put yourself through a simmering process of allowing the temperature not to go up too high, but sufficient to increase the action velocity of a certain way of combining things at a certain place and under certain conditions, under certain pressure, under certain rules of temperature. The duration is a tremendous factor and for that you have to learn how to be patient. And it is only that kind of an encouragement that will give you in time the chance to see really, when you then look back, why it was necessary that you went through all of that, and that you could not reach and jump over something. You cannot reach and jump over your knees. They have to disappear when you stand up. That's the way you jump.

That what takes place in a person in the growing process is constantly this kind of a wish: why haven't I grown up as yet sufficiently so that I can meet conditions as they are? And all the time the answer is: it is not up to you to meet all conditions as they are. You have to meet only the conditions that are suitable for you at the present time of your development. And this is what I mean by giving answers to questions.

There is a level of such a person where they can operate. They cannot operate above it. All it can give them is a certain stimulus. But there is no possibility for them to pull themselves up sufficiently so that they get there. They are not ready for that, like a man who flies to the Moon is not ready to live on the Moon, and far away even from the fact of living on Mars. We always take our unconsciousness with us. And our poverty, and our desire for sleep, and our laziness. And all such things have to be taken into account. Because if you don't, you don't hit the mark. When you explain, when you make statements, you have to be exact. You hit, you call it, a bull's eye, you shoot at it in the center of all things, not on the periphery. That is not hit. They cannot do anything with it because many times the question does come from their ignorance but it is sincere. And if they want to know, you must give them a little bit of food. But it has to be the right quality.

That is true for some people. There are in a group many who just come and are not really interested. Answer such people in accordance with their ignorance. I don't even call it in accordance with their wisdom because they don't have it. Don't waste perfectly good time on someone when there is nothing in that person that really wishes to know. Make a very sharp distinction between those people who repreaent already a certain level and are serious - and for them, you can go all out in trying to help them and build up enthusiasm and perspectives for them to continue. But don't waste your energy in going after these false, nonsensical statements which every once in a while appear. Tell them, go home and study. Read a book for six months before you come back. We are not interested in just spending time trying to convince someone against his will - or he has not even a will - he just asks a little bit. But what for? For the form, just to indicate maybe that he has come for a reason. He hasn't. There's no reason. Just happens.

On a Monday evening you have to weed out elements who do not belong. Monday evening is a Group II level. It is not a Group III. You don't have to cater to them. You don't have to become interested in having a large number of people. You must look for quality. Then you can talk in a short way, that is short sentences, because there is the wish for them to understand you, and when your language is exact it is not necessary to explain several times the same thing. You say what you have to say and that's it. And then tell them to Work in accordance with what you have said. And no further discussions. Because you cannot discuss anything. You have given them a task, or you have reminded them - now it's up to them. They asked a question - you gave an answer. Now it's up to them to Work it out. To digest what you have said and to act in accordance with what you have said. But you see how necessary it is to be exact. You cannot just ins blau hinein - talk a little bit about nonsense. Even if it is enthusiastically said, and even if you are sincere, you mean it, that doesn't help. It's good for opening a person, it's good for giving him an impression

that something is worthwhile and can exist, and that there is a possibility fof that kind of a person so that then they can go home and Work. But they must go home and Work. They must remember that Monday evening during the week. Every day you should ask them, "Do you think every day about what we have talked about? And when you meet again the following Monday, "Do you refer enough to what has been said? And when what has been said before and is not been acted upon, why in God's name do you say the same thing again? Tell them to get out. If they don't want to listen to you, and do Work, they don't belong in that group. You expect them to help maintain the level of that group. You cannot do it when all the time you have to repeat the same thing to a couple of nincompoops.

I say again, it is a group II. You want to disseminate knowledge, real knowledge based on your own experience. You must know what you're talking about. You have to allow enough time to understand the level of the question, where it comes from. It is not a question of argument. It's a question of the understanding of the question where it comes from. When you know it, then your answer must be correct. Don't beat around the bush with your own answer. It is this, and there is nothing else.

I think about this many times for myself. I see different people professing a knowledge of Gurdjieff. I read about it in some books. Of course I hear it here and there. And every once in a while it comes to me to criticize myself, to find out what am I doing, or what are we doing, or what is in those tapes which we every once in a while look at proudly and say, "So many!" Is it right? Are we correct? Do we talk esoteric knowledge? Do we talk the reality of that what is as experience worthwhile and can given you encouragement, and can one actually claim that it will lead to freedom? Is the experience sufficiently substantiated? So that then there is a very definite reason why one can talk about it convincingly.

But when we are still a little bit too wishy-washy something is lacking in the experience and something of the verification of that what has been said

is not entirely clear. And you must not fall into that trap. Make your answers, again I say it, make it short, but good, really good, so that there's no further question. That there cannot be an argument, that it can be understood the way it is meant. And then next week you can ask again, what did you do?

You cannot dish out esoteric knowledge and hope that it will be eaten. Hope is a little less than expectation, and expectation is a little less than demanding. You can demand when you give real knowledge that it is eaten and perhaps not so much in words, but in the way you say it. And to put it almost on penality of punishment. Don't bother about esoteric knowledge unless you mean to do something with it worthwhile. Don't bother about Gurdjieff when you want to place him in connection with a variety of a whole lot of other, or a whole galaxy, of philosophers. Don't make the mistake on the other hand, to think that Gurdjieff was the first person who pronounced esoteric knowledge. It has been known throughout all ages from the very beginning of human thought, and in the beginning much more by human behavior even than by thought or by feelings. When I said some time ago, talking about Faust, someone in a little group made a remark that he didn't know that Goethe had any idea about esoteric knowledge. And I kind of smiled about that. What does he know where esoteric knowledge is and where it can be found? Has he ever heard of Egypt? And what is there at the present time even decipherable for us, trying to understand a few little hieroglyphs? What does one not know? One must try to find out that Gurdjieff, for us has a unique place because he re-emphasizes what the Bible has been saying for a long time. When Gurdjieff introduces into the observation of 'I' a quality of benevolence - because we talked about the wolf and the sheep to become friends - it is a necessity as a responsibility laid on a development of consciousness that it must remember conscience. Otherwise the light is not sufficiently indicative of the direction where it should go. And moreover, the light is not sustained enough by the friction created as the result of the

emotional wish to become real against all obstacles.

And so when one does talk about a consciousness, and hand in hand with that, conscience, one talks about the development of a man as it should be . When Gurdjieff talks about esoteric knowledge in the sense of objectivity, and then afterwards talks about the benevolence of that it is not too late as yet for those who may be a little older, but that there is still hope; that constantly he introduces forms and concepts of Christianity, particularly about love and caring and really wishing, those who do not love animals have no place here, those who cannot understand relationships will never attain the kingdom of heaven. Such questions that are settled almost by a little stroke of a long sentence in which Ashiata Shiemash talks as it were to himself on the mountain Veziniama, and constantly trying to chastize himself so that then his thoughts could become purer and purer and finally become acceptable to His Endlessness. It is necessary to understand why Christ, when he came down and became Jesus on Earth, needed that form to convince people that that what he suffered he knew about what they suffered, because all that suffering belonged to the unconscious Earth is the same from the standpoint as looked from above. But then finally the solution of all that with the corss as the final word, in his life the finality of that word in dying allowed him to arise again on the third day.

Each time that one faces a difficulty in ones life and one wishes to face it and make up one's mind and say, "I know, I am not very strong, I know I fail, I know I have done certain things I know I should not have done. But so help me God this time I will bite my tongue, but I will now accomplish that what I needed to do. " That determination must come, it must come when you want to face death in the right way. Otherwise you will always have fear. But if anytime you could die, of course at any time you will live.

And that is why we talk about Work, because it could become that within oneself with which we become convinced that that what is necessary is the constancy of the wish. And the wish then, knowing oneself on this Earth and how

one lives becomes two-fold. The wish in the first place is the maintenance and the constance--constancy of an activity, to be active Working in the vineyard of the Lord. Not to wait or sit down on the stone and rest too long, but get up and be busy and walk and do this, do that. It will help you to overcome a state of instability in your mind when your body could become interested in doing. And your mind will follow with the attention that is required for doing that kind of physical activity.

But in the second place, that what a man is required to do, and to become, is the constancy in his activity for that what is as yet undeveloped. And never to lose track of the fact that that what is to be developed, can only be developed by an understanding of what one is. And perhaps in that understanding, the bondage which now ties us down to the unconscious state, has to be released, undone. Maybe the knot should be solved, sometimes I've said, cut like a Gordian knot. At all costs sometimes, dependent on how much is involved. But by taking little steps, and having then the hope gradually changing into the expectancy, and finally into the determination of the assurance that one is on the right road, then never mind after that. One keeps on going because the wish within oneself will never die.

That particular problem - when does Work become one's own; when can you really say that it is part of you? - It's really so simple. It is part of you when you can give it without losing it. When you remain for yourself what you are - even increase many times more of what you have been for by the fact of giving it away, you'll receive thousandfold that what was potential for someone else in the form of the actuality of yourself having grown up because of your wish to communicate.

That is one of the advantages of having to answer questions. That is why it is so necessary to do it in the right way. Because if you have any desire, as it were, to be heard for your own sake, you undo all the good that could come from your own effort to try to help someone. Truly, to be concerned with the state in which someone else is, when it is worthwhile to help, then by all means,

help. And don't shy away from it.

What will one talk about? How can one help to develop the talents which one has been given, which is within a man when he starts to grow up and fortunately having an ability - should he use them? Should he pay back what he has received? Should he try to create interest on them by investments? Should he utilize that what is as talent given for the purpose of his own Work, so that when the talent itself becomes apparent in the creation of certain things because of that ability, the looseness in wishing to become free even from, but what one has created oneself is an indication of how one should create one's 'I' - without any strings attached. It is that what is created is already of a higher nature. And you happen to be the channel through which it happened to flow. Your talents will be given back to you. They will come when you have Worked with them, when you have exhausted them, when you have understood the reason why they were given. And in gratitude, taking on the responsibility for their development; time and time again understanding it is not you who has that talent. It is that what you are to which a talent has been given as a reason for your own existence to become worth more in accordance with your ability to learn how to use what has been given for the purpose of your own development and to the praise of God.

We'll talk more about these things. Because it has to be deepened more and more. On that we can let the solidarity of a group rest, when within you you could create solidity.

I hope you have a good week. I hope you can Work a great deal.

Goodnight.

END TAPE

Transcribed:Anne Hanson
ROUGH: Jessica
proof: V. C. Lanier
proof: Mollie Wolfe